



Course Report 2015

Subject	Graphic Communication
Level	National 5

The statistics used in this report have been compiled before the completion of any Post Results Services.

This report provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers/lecturers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding. It would be helpful to read this report in conjunction with the published assessment and marking instructions for the examination.

Section 1: Comments on the Assessment

Component 1: Question paper

Overall the make-up of the question paper represented a good mix of questions covering the main elements contained in the National 5 Graphic Communication Course Assessment Specification. Areas included:

- ◆ Computer Aided Design/Draughting techniques.
- ◆ Advantages and disadvantages of manual and electronic techniques.
- ◆ Spatial awareness.
- ◆ Drawing standards, protocols and conventions.
- ◆ Use of colour, layout and presentation.
- ◆ Graphic Communication as it impacts on our environment and society.

The content coverage of the 2015 question paper was in line with the requirements of the National 5 Graphic Communication Course Assessment Specification. The question paper took a slightly different approach to that used in the 2014 question paper. Questions were longer and each contained a range of topic areas based around a different central theme for each question. The changes that were introduced in the question paper performed well, and as was expected.

Component 2: Assignment

The assignment is an Internally Assessed Course Component Assessment (IACCA) marked out of 60 marks, and represents 50% of the Course award.

There are three assignment tasks to choose from, which are provided by the SQA. These have not changed from session 2013–14. These tasks consisted of two 'closed brief' scenarios and one 'open brief'. Either the centre or candidate could choose which task to complete. Each task has the same assessment criteria.

Section 2: Comments on candidate performance

Component 1: Question paper

On the whole, candidates appear to have been well prepared for this examination. Centres are continuing to embrace the new approaches and content of this assessment component. The performance of the candidates demonstrates that centres are mostly covering the correct topic areas in preparation for the question paper.

Candidate performance was generally good in responding to questions on 3D CAD modelling. There was a marked improvement in candidate application of correct 3D CAD terminology, and this has resulted in improved performance in this topic area compared to last year. Again, this year, the candidates who chose to support their responses by using

sketches generally performed better than those choosing to respond purely by written means.

Candidates generally performed well in the questions based around spatial awareness and layout elements and principles.

Component 2: Assignment

The verification team reported seeing a range of approaches to the IACCA tasks. Most candidates kept within the 10 page limit for submissions and used a variety of manual and electronic responses to generate assessment evidence.

Fewer centres chose to supply their candidates with more information about the assignment task than last year. There were still a number of centres that provided candidates with pre-printed title sheets, and it was noted by the verification team that choosing a 'pro-forma' approach to the task had the effect of limiting their candidate's responses; marks tended to be generally lower.

A number of centres chose the closed-brief, Aqua-J juice bottle task; responses in this task were less varied and more formulaic. Centres that selected the 'Thirst4music' brief generally completed these to a high standard, although the products modelled were more complex than required.

Section 3: Areas in which candidates performed well

Component 1: Question paper

Question 2 (b): Many candidates were able to identify at least one of the pictorial assemblies from the selection provided.

Question 4 (a): Most candidates were able to achieve most of the marks for describing how to 3D CAD model the skateboard wheel. Some candidates chose to use the more inefficient approach of carrying out a number of extrusions, rather than choosing to carry out a single revolution. Although the extrusion option is a valid approach to answering the question, candidates should always try to select the most efficient means so that the question can be answered in the quickest and simplest manner.

Question 4 (c) (i) & (ii): Most candidates were able to describe where the graphic designer had used the design principles of contrast and unity.

Question 4 (e): Most candidates were able to achieve at least 3 of the available 5 marks for identifying pieces of information that do not conform to British Standard conventions within the provided working drawing.

Component 2: Assignment

Whilst there is no formal statistical breakdown of the marks, it was agreed by the verification team that the production drawings component was completed to a high standard by most

candidates. Where errors had been made, it was due to the set-up of the various software packages and the application of British Standards.

Most candidates had used 3D CAD to create their production drawings — only one centre in the sample used traditional, manual drawing board technology to create these drawings.

Section 4: Areas which candidates found demanding

Component 1: Question paper

Question 1 (a): Some candidates were only able to state one reason why a 3D CAD illustration would have been produced to achieve one mark in this question.

Question 1 (b): Some candidates were unable to identify the correct name for the exploded isometric view.

Question 2 (c): Some candidates had difficulty in identifying that a CAD library is used to produce a variety of assemblies quickly and efficiently.

Question 4 (b): Some candidates found it challenging to articulate how alignment was used in the two skateboard graphics. Although some candidates stated different graphic elements within each graphic, they did not describe how they had been aligned.

Component 2: Assignment

Candidates found the research and analysis component challenging. This is perhaps due to the new nature of this approach to graphic communication.

Many candidates also found preliminary graphics challenging — many had traced production drawings and therefore were awarded no marks — and it is evident that centres should focus on this aspect more in the learning and teaching.

It was clear that some centres are not yet comfortable with the promotional graphics element — especially when it comes to creative use of DTP layouts and design elements and principles.

Section 5: Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

Component 1: Question paper

In undertaking examination preparation for next diet, centres should encourage candidates to support their responses with sketches where appropriate. Although not a requirement, it was identified from both the 2014 and 2015 examinations that some candidates may find it challenging to fully articulate some of their responses through written means only. This was

particularly evident in 3D CAD modelling questions. Although pencil may be used to construct a sketch, any final sketch to support a response should be in blue or black ink.

Candidates should ensure that, when using additional space at the rear of the question paper to continue their response, their response is clearly indicated and identified.

Centres are reminded to ensure that candidates are using the correct terminology as detailed in the National 5 Graphic Communication Course Assessment Specification. This has particular importance when responding to 3D CAD modelling questions and drawing standards, conventions and protocol type questions.

It was evident from this year's diet that although centres are preparing their candidates well for the new content introduced to National 5, there appears to have been a decline in candidate performance in the more traditional content, such as: true shape, orthographic projection and surface developments.

Centres should ensure that they encourage candidates to respond to each question in light of the command word used in each (ie State, Explain, Indicate, Describe etc.).

Please note that the National 5 Course Assessment Specification has been updated for the 2015–16 diet. No new content has been added, only clarification of the existing content.

Component 2: Assignment

Section 1: Research & analysis

The verification team witnessed a wide range of approaches to the research and analysis component. Where this section had been completed well, candidates had completed some research that confirmed all aspects of the assignment brief. Several centres generously marked candidates who only researched the graphic design aspect of the task.

Many candidates who completed the Aqua-J task had purely focused on the graphic design, colour scheme and target market at the expense of other aspects, such as production drawings. Centres should encourage candidates to consider all aspects of the assignment that will require research and analysis.

Section 2: Preliminary graphics

Some candidates produced retrospective planning. Work that is traced or is retrospective does not attract any marks. Several centres did not identify these issues and, subsequently, candidates had their marks reduced during verification.

Several centres were generous in their assessment of candidates with regards to creating sufficient evidence to generate production drawings. Centres should consider whether the evidence is clear and detailed enough to enable the creation of a 3D CAD model or manual drawings.

Where preliminary promotional layouts had been completed well, candidates made clear reference to design elements and principles and the DTP features and techniques they were

intending to use. There should be a clear indication which promotional layout will be developed into the final item.

Section 3: Production graphics

In all, production graphics were generously marked. Centres are reminded that BS8888 is the standard to be applied to these drawings; candidates should be able to change any settings in their CAD application to reflect these standards. There should be sufficient views and dimensions to enable the product to be re-drawn via 3D CAD, if necessary.

Technical detail must be clear and relevant to the task. Where sectional, enlargements or exploded views are created, they must provide additional information or enhance the clarity of the drawings. Several centres had given marks for simply creating a view.

Centres should ensure candidates have a firm knowledge of British Standards, along with an understanding of the relevance of particular technical graphics to a specific situation.

Section 4: Promotional graphics

Many centres incorrectly assessed candidates for producing a promotional item in relation to a brief. Both the Aqua-J and the Buzz-It tasks have specific promotional activities that a candidate must choose from. A candidate who does not respond to the brief cannot be awarded any marks for this activity. However, subsequent marks for illustration and the use of layout techniques may be assessed from the candidate's strongest work. This is particularly useful if a candidate has created more promotional work than was required by the brief.

Section 5: Evaluation

The evaluation component was generally assessed well by most centres; most candidates had focused on the DTP component.

Centres are reminded that candidates can evaluate any aspect of their work. A high marking evaluation should make reference to the brief and how the graphics they have produced meet the requirements of the brief.

Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2014	6129
------------------------------------	------

Number of resulted entries in 2015	6707
------------------------------------	------

Statistical information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark - 120				
A	37.4%	37.4%	2510	84
B	28.2%	65.7%	1894	72
C	19.9%	85.6%	1337	60
D	6.1%	91.7%	412	54
No award	8.3%	-	554	-

For this Course, the intention was to set an assessment with grade boundaries at the notional values of 50% for a Grade C and 70% for a Grade A.